REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of Claims 1-20, which are all of the pending claims, over the prior art. In particular, Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2004/0181753 (Michaelides), and Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Michaelides in view of U.S. Patent 6,704,743 (Martin).

It is noted that the previous rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 were withdrawn.

Applicants are herewith filing a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to continue the prosecution of the present application.

This Amendment is being submitted to amend independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 to better define the subject matters of these claims.

For the reasons discussed below in detail, Claims 1-20 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-20.

The present invention relates to mapping data from a source to a destination, and in particular, to doing this in a way that makes it easy to work with different types of data sources. This is done by providing a framework, or system, having a group of components, each of which can be readily modified or replaced independent of the other components, for handling various functions as data are mapped from the source to the destination. More specifically, the first components is used for reading the data from the source, and the second of the components is

used for receiving the data from the first of the components and for processing the read data according to a set of rules. The third component is used for receiving the data from the second of the components and for loading the data into the data destination.

Mapping data in this way allows, for example, one application to be accessed by different users in different parts of the world even though those users might use different formats for dates, time and money, or for other reasons. Also, the present invention can map data in different formats into a single, common database by simply changing or replacing the appropriate component of the mapping process used with a particular individual. For example, the above-mentioned second component of the system includes a formatter for converting selected dates from a first format to a second format. The use of this formatter in this way eliminates the need for writing code for formatting dates.

The independent nature of the above-discussed components is an important aspect of the present invention. This feature of the invention is discussed in paragraphs 19-23 of the application. There, it is explained that each of the components 16, 20, 22, 24 and 26 operates independently of the other of the components, so that each component can be modified or replaced without affecting the operation of the other components. Also, as discussed in paragraphs 19-23 of the specification, because of this independent operation, the individual components 16, 20, 22, 24 and 26 can be updated or modified by authorized administrators during use of the framework 10. Specific examples of a file or code that can be used with or in framework 10 are shown in Figures 3-6.

Michaelides, which is the primary reference relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims describes a software tool for converting a source format to a target format. As shown in Figure 6 of Michaelides, this software tool is comprised of a series of functional blocks,

including a transformation engine, a formatting engine, a user interface, a feed database and a rule database. These functional blocks, however, do not operate in an independent manner, as the components of the present invention do. For instance, the functional blocks of Michaelides use rules from other functional blocks to process the data. Thus, a change in one functional block may have a direct affect on the specific way another functional block operate.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 are being amended to better define the differences between these claims and the prior art. In particular, each of these claims is being amended to describe positively the limitation that the second component includes a formatter for converting selected dates from a first format to a second format, thereby eliminating the need for writing code for formatting these selected dates.

This feature of the present invention is specifically discussed in the specification on page 5, paragraph 25. This portion of the specification explains that a source system may send a date in the format of yyyymmdd, but the database table may accept only a timestamp. The present invention, by utilizing the above-described formatter, eliminates the need for writing code for formatting a date within the business logic classes.

Michaelides does not disclose or render obvious providing the above-mentioned second component with this formatter. This formatter helps the components achieve the desired independent operation by, as mentioned above, eliminating the need for writing code for formatting the selected dates.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest this feature of the present invention.

For instance, Martin describes a method and system for managing entities in an object-oriented environment, in which parameters or fields are selectively inherited from parent entities and into child entities. This inheritance is responsive to persistent indications of the inheritability of such parameters or fields stored in memory. In the disclosed procedure, entities from an object-oriented environment in a computer system are managed by creating a child entity based on a parent entity for which a persistent representation has been created in a non-volatile memory in the computer system. This non-volatile memory may be accessed to determine whether a parameter for the parent entity is inheritable. In addition, the parameter is inherited into the child entity if the parameter for the parent entity is determined to be inheritable.

Martin was cited primarily for its disclosure of verifying the integrity of read data by checking for count and data consistencies. This reference does not disclose and does not address providing a system component, of the type used in the present invention, with a formatter for converting dates from a first format to a second format, as described in the independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7 and 13 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6, 19 and 20 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1; and Claims 8-12 are dependent from Claim 7 and are allowable therewith. Also, Claims 14-18 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 13. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1-20.

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy